DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 650 EA 017 227

AUTHOR Cannings, Terence R.; Williams, Richard C.
TITLE Improving School Programs--Some Administrative Insights and Policy Guidelines.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 84
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Oriented Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Grants; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *Program Proposals; Proposal Writing; *School Support; *State Federal Aid; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV C

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the attempts of the state of California to select and promote new educational practices under the auspices of ESEA Title IVC. First, the strategies adopted in California for selecting and promoting new programs are outlined in order to raise the question of the effectiveness of these procedures. Next, the research design is described: a 2-year study of the process of change in five Title IVC projects in four school districts in southern California. Data were collected through interviews, surveys, observations of staff development activities, and associated records and files. Through cross-validation of data, certain patterns, themes, and categories of variables emerged, and relationships among them were analyzed. Four factors were identified as detrimental to the success of the five projects: site instability, lack of ownership, inappropriate planning models, and conflicting incentive systems. Each is discussed at length, and the implications derived for state and private funding agencies attempting to implement computer literacy programs lead to these suggestions: (1) replace extensive and detailed proposals with more generalized "concept papers"; (2) offer developmental grants to encourage local ownership; (3) conduct evaluations jointly with applicants; and (4) allow sufficient time for implementation of the project (3-5 years). (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terence R. Cannings

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED249650

EA 017 227

IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAMS

-- Some Administrative Insights and Policy Guidelines

Terence R. Cannings

Pepperdine University

Richard C. Williams

UCLA

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, April 23, 1984

IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAMS -- School Administrative Insights and Policy Guidelines

Each year countless private foundations and public agencies award financial grants to individuals and organizations who apply for support of research or developmental activities. The number of applicants and the amount of funds requested generally far exceed the resources available. Hence granting agencies face the difficult task of equitably and efficiently selecting a few from the many. But is seeding the grass roots the most efficient way to promote program development? Can local school sites initiate, implement and integrate programs into an already overcrowded curriculum which is often mandated by the school district office? Will funding agencies such as the state department of education grant sufficient automony and flexibility to a recepient of development funds? Are there any inhibiting factors?

Many state departments of education are now facing that problem. Let us take one example: the computer revolution is impacting schools across the nation. At the beginning of this year 325,000 microcomputers had found their way into American schools. These microcomputers are being used for instruction in 86% of all school districts. More than 75% of all junior high schools and approximately two-thirds of elementary school utilize at least one microcomputer. But the states are also getting into the act. Thirty three have Commissions or task forces in educational computing, nineteen have legislation pending or in the books, while 22 states have mandated courses in computer literacy as of January, 1984. In addition, sixteen states have established computer literacy requirements for teacher certification and thirteen have formed computer education centers on a statewide basis.

If state legislators mandate a computer literacy requirement (whatever that may be) for the state schools, what is the best way to promote, implement and sustain

these new programs? This study analyses the attempts of one public agency, the state of California, to promote new educational practices under the auspices of ESEA Title IVC. The findings of the study provide implications for any private or public insitution embarking on implementing new educational requirements at school sites.

In this paper we will outline the strategies adopted in California to select and promote new programs; describe briefly the research design; discuss the findings; and finally suggest some implications for the future funding of new programs such as computer literacy.

Previous Practices

In California, the Educational Innovation and Planning Commission (EIPC) has utilized a rather standard procedure for screening proposals school districts had submitted for funding under ESEA Title IVc, and for determining whether the projects that had been funded would continue to receive support during the three-year term of their grant. The process described below will be very recognizable to anyone familiar with the standard planning literature. The following is a brief description of the steps that were taken:

1. School districts submitted proposals which contained: an overview of the proposal, a rather extensive discussion of what they viewed as the problem they were going to address, the specific procedures and steps they were going to follow in developing their innovation, a time-line for the project, an evaluation scheme, and a detailed budget that was often linked to their time-lines. (End note 1)
2. A rather elaborate screening process was developed. Dozens of educators and lay citizens would gather in the state capitol for a week to review the proposals. A complex rating system was established whereby subgroups would award points to the various components of each proposal (e.g., adequacy of

procedures, budget, evaluation scheme). The projects selected were based on the total points awarded by the reviewing panel. (End note 2)

3. After the grants were awarded, the districts were expected to implement their plans as outlined in their proposal. The evaluations were to be submitted as detailed in the proposal and as required by state guidelines. Ostensibly, decisions about continued funding for the three years of the grant were to be made on the basis of interim evaluation reports.
4. At the end of the three-year grants, the final project evaluations were used to decide whether or not the district would receive continuation and dissemination grants that would allow the project staff to travel around the state and introduce their innovations to other interested districts.

In summary, the entire process was considered very linear, politically clean, and rational. The projects would be judged solely on merit, and the decisions would be made by "grass-roots" educators and citizens who could draw upon their extensive practical experience and thereby recognize projects that would be useful in the schools. This procedure was democratic, linear planner's dream. But did it work out that way?

Research Design and Methodology

For this exploratory research a case study approach was used because it provided a way to explore the complex organizational, institutional, and personal dynamics of the change process. This methodology enabled us to make detailed observations of several schools' attempts to implement new programs. As Herriott and Gross (1979) argue, the case study approach provides "the types of data needed to examine the dynamics of educational change attempts, a problem that requires longitudinal data, holistic perspectives, and an analysis of the reciprocal interplay among a complex set of variables." (p. 354). We agree.

Each of the case studies describes a major innovative effort of one school district.

Sample

A two-year study was conducted of the process of change in five Title IV-C projects in four school districts. These districts received more than $300,000 from the EIPC for their first year. When we selected the projects for this study we considered a districts' proximity to Los Angeles, its mix of elementary and high schools, and its wide variety of programs and locations. Figure I describes the characteristics of the innovations that were introduced (see Appendix A for a detailed description). As can be seen, the projects represent several innovations that are located in a crossection of schools in different settings in Southern California.

Figure I

Project Characteristics

Project	Intervention Technique	Target Population	Substantive Focus
1	Staff development Materials development	Elementary students	Behavior modification
2	Staff development Community involvement	Elementary students Community	Oral communication skills Community participation
3	Staff development	Elementary students	Language arts -- English & Spanish
4	Staff development -- adoption of Madeline Hunter's Teaching Model	Secondary students	Teaching basic skills -- secondary schools
5	Development, demonstration and field testing of district reading program and methodology	Elementary students with reading difficulties	Teaching reading

Data Collection

Data were collected through use of:

1. Interviews
2. Surveys
3. Observations
4. Records and files

Interviews were conducted with people working on the projects and people involved with the selection process. Those interviewed included: state department officials; school district personnel (superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors, coordinators, proposal writers); school administrators, project directors; teachers, and parents. The interviews included open-ended questions concerning the process of change in the school district; the initiation of the project, involvement of key figures and, implementation of the project. The questions permitted individuals to state their perceptions of the program, to stress those aspects of the change process which they felt to be important and to provide information about the overall pattern of events.

Interviews were conducted at many stages of the project. Initially, interviews indicated the most important characteristics of the district, the role of district office personnel in writing and approving proposals, and the mode and amount of support offered the school site personnel. Teachers, school principals, and parents were approached for their interpretations of change processes and strategies during the first two years of the project and at the end of the funding period.

Teachers were given a written survey at the beginning and end of the project's second year. Classroom observations provided additional data. The frequency of visits to classrooms and schools depended on project development -- as

projects developed, weekly or bi-weekly visits were made. However, at least one visit was made to each project every two weeks to observe teachers and students in classrooms and to discuss project development with principals, project directors, and teachers.

Observations were made of staff development courses, school workshops, faculty meetings SDE consultants and evaluation meetings, and any other relevant meetings. To fully comprehend the selection process, some time was spent in Sacramento and other locations observing EIPC meetings, SDE conferences including the annual "Management of Change" seminar, and the procedure whereby projects were selected for funding.

The files and records reviewed included: evaluation reports from SDE consultants, evaluators and teachers, project applications, renewal proposals and SDE guidelines.

Data Analysis

Each case study report provides a unique opportunity to examine the planned educational change process. To enhance the validity of the field observations the technique of "triangulation" (Babbie, 1979, p. 110) was used. That is, we cross-validated our data through the use of multiple observations and data sources. We compared our own separate observations and then compared our interpretations with those made by the project's evaluator. We also had access to the state department of education files, enabling further cross-validation.

We have used inductive analysis to identify the patterns, themes and categories in data -- patterns and categories which have emerged out of the data rather than being decided upon prior to data collection and analysis. For analyzing the data the constant comparative methodology advocated by Glaser and

Strauss (1967) was used, that is, theory-generating instead of theory-testing. From observations, interviews, and reviews of records and files, categories of variables and relationships among them will be analyzed to increase our knowledge of the change process.

Findings

We have identified four factors that, in our opinion, stand out as influencing the various Projects' ability to achieve their goal of inventing, developing and initially adopting sound educational innovations: site instability, lack of ownership, inappropriate planning model, and conflicting incentive systems.

Site Instability. Inventing, developing, and critically testing innovations usually takes a considerable amount of time and concentration. Creating ideas and plans, devising alternative through trial and error, selecting the most promising approach and constantly appraising the workability and likely reception of a invention in the market place (schools), is a tiring process. These steps are best carried out in settings that are free of the "real world" problems and in which the developer has the support and encouragement of organizational leaders. It is hard enough to devise an innovation without having to deal with other distractions. This, of course, is the reason why many industries have often established separate research facilities in protected environments.

Reviewing these five case studies we were constantly reminded of how instable these settings were for invention purposes. Consider the following:

> Language Improvement. There was considerable community unrest. The budget was affected by the need to pay workmen's compensation to a community liasion worker--and the project lost control of that part of the project; the three instructional aides resigned at a critical time in the second year.

Discipline-Plus. Both of the schools added additional projects in the second year; in the beginning of the second year the district's priorities shifted away from discipline toward improving reading scores; a threatened teachers' strike influenced the project's operation and first year evaluation.

New Reading. The district had four superintendents in three years, new principals were appointed in two schools during the second project year, two district project supporters departed.

Secondary-Teaching. The district kept attracting new projects--at the beginning of the second year the projects director was spending only about 12 percent of her time on the Title IVc project.

Bilingual Affect. There was 50% school staff transiency rate, the first school site was over-crowded and in a constant state of turmoil, the principal was not supportive, and another major project was concurrently operating in the school.

These site instabilities often caused the project directors to direct their attention from the invention process or to alter substantially the original project plans or purposes. Some of the site instabilities were beyond the project directors' control, e.g., threatened teacher strike, superintendent resignations, declining reading scores. Others, however, such as adopting additional projects, could have been minimized and avoided. Regardless, the effect was to distract the director's attention away from invention and development toward settling disputes or securing additional organizational support and protection. Given only two years to complete their work, these distractions often proved to be significant factors in determining the projects' progress.

Lack of Ownership. A common theme running throughout the educational change literature is the importance ownership plays in implementing organizational change. Ownership, as used here, means that those who will be effected by innovation (be it a product or a process) must have some feeling that they have been involved in decisions to develop or adopt the innovation and that they understand the potential benefits that might result from the innovation. If those who are to be affected by the change have a feeling of ownership the, it is argued, they will exhibit far less resistence to the planned change and, consequently, the likiihood of successful development and adoption is greatly increased. Stated another way, many people

tend to resist changes that are imposed from the outside without warning.

A review of the case studies lend to support the vital role ownership plays in inventing, developing and initially adopting innovations:

> Language Improvement. There was virtually no ownership at first; the project was initiated by one principal with central administrative staff cooperation. Teacher ownership of the project eventually emerged but only after half of the development period had passed. The project's development accelerated considerably after such ownership was secured.
>
> Discipline-Plus. Here the vital role of ownership stands out clearly. In the initiating school there was ownership from the very beginning and the project developed quite smoothly. In the neighboring school no ownership was evident and the project continued to face faculty and administrator resistance throughout its history.
>
> New Reading. Essentially ownership was limited to one person and his immediate assistant. The project caught on only superficially with the teachers and really was never fully tried out in the classroom.
>
> Secondary Teaching. This project originated with the central administration; the district's teachers, with a few exceptions, never did embrace the project or enthusiastically participate in it.
>
> Bilingual Affect. Ownership was established early in the first project school and a feeling of cohesiveness developed among the participating teachers. This project's momentum was shattered during the second year when it was transferred to a second school. As a result, the first school's teachers felt betrayed and the second-school's teachers, who were mandated to participate, never developed much ownership.

Looking across projects one sees that ownership was indeed a vital factor. Where it was present, projects tended to make greater progress towards their goals; where it was absent, projects ran in to problems. Interestingly, each project had submitted state-required sign-off sheets that assured that the various project consituencies had been notified of the project application. The reason for this sign-off procedure was to increase the likelihood of participant ownership. Apparently in some projects either this sign-off procedure was only superficially followed or the procedure was insufficiently powerful to build initial participant ownership.

Inappropirate Panning Model

The California Title IVc program administration, with its required formal, detailed proposal, contains some traditional assumptions about program planning and operation. It assumes that the ultimate program implementation will proceed most efficiently if the proposed program's specific operating details program (e.g., timetable, budget, personnel, evaluation) are determined before the funding is granted. Likely two ideas underlie these requirements: One, the program directors will have a detailed blueprint they can follow and this will ease program administration and reduce problems; and two, a detailed plan gives the initial reviewing panel some idea of whether or not the model is likely to succeed and sme grasp of the program director's organizational and planning skills.

There appears to be an implicit assumption that this linear-planning model is closely related to what will occur when the innovation is invented, developed, and initially adopted.

This same logic supports the formal application that is required to support request for third-year funding. Again projects are expected to submit detailed descriptions of what has transpired and to specify exactly what will take place during the third year.

The case studies illustrate what some school researchers (Clark, 1980) have pointed out namely, that detailed, linear-planning modesl often bear very little resemblance to what actually occurs in public school operations. There are simply too many unknown, uncontrollable and unpredictable variables to make such detailed planning worth all the time and effort. For example, in these case studies:

Language Improvement. Four months elapsed before a project director was appointed, the teacher initially viewed the program director as merely a resource teacher. The teachers did not become involved in or very receptive to the project until an entire year had passed. The programs community relations component floundered because one of the community liaison people was injured "on-the-job" and no replacement could be hired because of lack of funds.

Discipline-Plus. The program was implemented in two schools rather than one, as originally planned. The second school, partly because of lack of ownership, did not get into "the spirit" of the project; both schools added other projects during the second year and the district's priorities shifted away from disciplinary problems toward reading, thus lessening district support of and commitment to the project. The proposed teacher strike "soured" teacher attitude toward their work and negatively influenced the first year evaluations.

New Reading. The district supporters of the program departed, leaving the project director vulnerable to attacks; this limited his credence with teachers. The district "lost funds," necessitating his reducing the staff and the scope of activities; district and community pressures for improving pupil achievement scores made it too risky for teachers to use these unproven reading materials instead of district approved and published materials.

Secondary-Teaching. The district's successfully acquiring other funded projects reduced the director's time on this project to only 12 percent. Secondary teachers had somewhat negative reactions to proposals that they should improve their teaching skills; a very large percentage of participating teachers, during the second year, were from other school districts because many of the original district teachers chose not to continue to participate. This substantially altered the district's goal of improving its secondary schools curriculum and instructional program.

Bilingual Affect. The principal in the original school was very negative toward the project--this eventually resulted in its being transferred to a second school; the second school was selected on a whim--not on the basis of any carefully thought out rationale. After moving to a second school the project essentially died out in the first school. Thus rather than having a two year invention and development program in one school it had a one year invention and development in two schools.

The rather profound program alterations in these projects, often based on unpredictable events, raises serious questions, we feel about the rationale for detailed planning proposals both when seeking origianl funds and when applying for continuation funds.

But there is another basic effect these detailed planning requirements had--the planning process actually influenced the projects' development. As will be recalled, one of the main purposes of Title IVc is to encourage teachers to invent and develop their innovative ideas. However, the detailed planning proposals, which generally ran between 100-200 pages, made it very difficult for teachers to find the time or energy to develop a proposal. Often the result, as is illustrated in these case studies, is that idea generation and proposal development is carried out at the district level, often by an administrator--without sufficient teacher involvement. The result was that the teachers who are supposed to participate, when learning of the funding decision, were often angered that they had not been informed. This diminished their enthusiasm for the project and retarded the development of teacher ownership. It also meant that project directors had to give an inordinate amount of time to developing the third-year funding proposals. These usually run close to 100 pages in length and take from 3-8 weeks of the project director's time at a critical period during the project's second year.

Conflicting Incentive Systems

By incentive systems we refer to the reasons, the rewards, that motivate individuals to participate in the Title IVc program. Likely the various participants, project directors, superintendents, teachers, state department consultants, and private evaluators, if asked their reasons for participating would reply that they want to do what is "best for kids." They want to be part of a process that develops better educational programs for the schools. And there is no reason to question that basic underlying motive.

But we suspect that beneath that general rationale are other organizational and personal motivations, or incentives, that are somewhat in conflict among the various participants. And those incentive conflicts may negatively retard the invention and development of educational innovations that are thoroughly developed and field tested before being presented to state and national groups for dissemination. Consider the following:

School district administrators and project directors-- while their initial and continuing commitment is to developing an effective innovation, are also motivated to receive third-year funding and eventually "exemplary" status. Districts receiving Title IVc funds usually shift personnel around, hire additional personnel, and, in large districts, maintain full-time staffs to seek external funding. Districts try very hard to continue the the flow of external funds in order to support district personnel who are dependent on such funds. These personnel-funding needs often become important, and sometimes dominant district concerns. Similarly, district administrators and project directors seek recognition for their work. Achieving "exemplary" status, with the exposure that comes form touring the state on the Title IVc "road show," carries relatively high status in school communities and in the school district status system. It symbolizes that a district is "innovative" and working hard to improve schooling. It makes district educators look good!

In all the districts we studied we noted almost a preoccupation with achieving third-year funding and exemplary status. This resulted in a strong concern with "getting the test scores up" in order to convince authorities that the project "works." The commitment to really taking a careful critical look at what they were doing gave way to marshalling whatever evidence available to show that the project should be continued and considered exemplary.

This had profound effects on the projects. For example, in Language Improvement, the project director wanted to change the program design after one year to include a new group of students, but the evaluator advised him not to do so because the changes in scores would not be as pronounced. The evaluator in the Discipline-Plus project was fired because his evaluations in the project

director's opinion, did not adequately measure the program's value. All the projects took an inordinate amount of time at a critical time in their project to seek third-year funding, even though some projects had not really even been implemented as originally designed, e.g., Language Improvement, New Reading, Secondary Teaching.

The state department consultants, who visited each project to monitor project programs and signal the state about non-compliance, often became school district advocates. Among their own social system of consultants, they build a reputation for serving as consultants to projects that "made it"--that is, acheived exemplary status. Thus, rather than taking a hard critical look at what the projects were doing, the consultants sometimes became confidential advisors who advised project directors on how to write their reports in a way that would most likely result in winning additional funding and a crack at exemplary status.

Consider the evaluators--most are university professors or independent consultants who earn income from conducting evaluations. While all want to be considered independent, respectable evaluators, evaluators as a group face an economic/professional conflict of interest. That is, they must be respectable in their work, but they cannot earn a reputation as being "too tough" because project directors, who seek additional funding and possible exemplary status will not hire them. We raise this as a general issue in these cases; we have no evidence that any of the evaluators did, indeed, compromise their ethical or professional standards in evaluating these projects.

Similarly, project directors are not motivated to fully report external evaluation reports when submitting proposals for additional funding. In one case here, the evaluator's consistent observation that the project had not built an "advocacy base" was not emphasized in the third-year funding report, even though that observation pinpointed a critical weakness in the project.

As with the state consultants, the evaluator's role of external critic, who continually asks though questions and seeks valid data, can be transposed into a project advocate who works with the project director to make everything "look good."

Thus one finds a process where the original intent of inventing, developing, and critically assessing the merits of educational innovations becomes transformed into a process where the various parties seek, instead, to do everything possible to make the project "look good"--and receive the funding and accolades that follow. Given this tendency, it is difficult to be sure that the projects that are ultimately disseminated are as effective as their originators proclaimed them to be.

In summary, these case studies have revealed that California's Title IVc program did not fully achieve the desired results. The state expected the sites would carefully follow the project plan that was submitted, that the programs would be carefully studied by an external evaluator, and that the result would be a critically examined innovation that could be further field tested and validated and possibly offered for statewide or national dissemination.

The result was quite different. Because of both expected and unexpected events, the predetermined plan was often changed dramatically. The evaluators and external monitors often joined with the project directors to help them present the best case possible for third-year funding and, eventually, exemplary status. The goal of critical examination was transformed into seeking additional funds and individual and school district fame.

The Implications

Since ESEA Title IVc no longer exists, one might conclude that the findings of our research have few implications for educational practice today.

To be sure, the findings most directly relate to the ESEA Title IVC program, but there are funding programs operating today that can benefit from what we have learned. We are referring in particular to the increased attention private foundations and corporations are giving to the needs of public schools. There are striking similarities between ESEA Title IVc and some private funding programs. Title IVc and many private and public programs maximize local initiative. In other words, they encourage local school or districts to indentify their own needs and they provide the schools or districts with funds to develop projects or innovations. Also, they must make choices among many proposals that are submitted, and they will likely seek some form of proposal upon which they can judge the proposed project's merits and subsequently award funds. It is not unlikely that the linear planning model that Title IVc used will also appeal to private funding sources.

Our research suggests that such a model has severe limitations when used for initially determining the relative merit of various projects and when used as a yardstick for determining a project's progress. This model simply does not adequately account for the characteristics of the schools as a social system and as an open system. The school's social system is simply not consistent with such a model. For example, the incentive system of districts is to get funding and, once obtained, to do whatever necessary to retain the funding. Under the Title IVc linear model, the schools begin increasingly to direct their attention <u>toward</u> how they con look successful--and <u>away</u> from taking a close, critical look at whether or not their innovation was really working and worthy of dissemination. Thus, one very important reason for this "field-based" innovation invention was compromised.

As an open system, schools and school districts are exceedingly vulnerable to external pressures that are beyond their control. And these events can raise havoc with the best-laid plans and linear time-tables. Our districts experienced teacher strikes, school board and community political problems, and turnover of critical teacher and administrative staff. These naturally occuring events profoundly affected not only the time-table but in some instances, the very ability of the project staff to proceed with their work.

So what is to be done? Should funding agencies simply give out funds without and formal proposals, or should they forget public school districts and school sites as places where important innovations can be tried out? We think not. The idea of local school invention and development is powerful and should be utilized to its fullest. But the process through which funding agencies determine where to place their money and how they assess the progress the projects are making must be compatible with the realities of schooling. If you are state or private funding agency attempting to implement computer literacy programs. We suggest the following:

1. Do not use extensive proposals that required detailed plans and time-tables and evaluation designs. Instead, require a "concept paper" in which the applicants discuss fully the problems they are addressing and the ideas they have in mind for solving the problem. The emphasis would be on their insights, creativity, and the extent to which they are addressing a significant problem.

2. After reviewing the concept paper, a developmental grant would be offered to applicants with the most intriguing proposals. The applicants would use those funds to fully develop the idea and build local support for and "ownership" of it. The funding agency would work cooperatively with the applicant in this regard, including establishing the budget and a sound evaluation plan.

Once these arrangements are agreed upon, the funds would be granted and the work would begin.

3. Evaluations would be jointly conducted by the applicant and the funding agency. Every effort should be made to diminish the competitiveness of the process and any "we-they" relationship between the funder and the applicant. The modus operendi should be one of two agencies interested in a common project who are working together to maximize the likelihood of success. This won't guarantee success, but it will greatly increase the likelihood that the project will have a maximum chance of being fully developed and being judged on its real merits.

4. Allow sufficient time for teacher ownership of the project and hence implementation to grow so that the program will become institutionalized. A three to five year period appears necessary before a final assessment is made as to the program's effectiveness.

In summary, SDE officials or private agencies interested in promoting computer literacy should consider:

- funding at the school site level
- requiring an initial concept paper
- selecting outstanding concept papers for developmental funding
- conducting joint evaluation
- guaranteeing a 3-5 year development period.

Endnotes

1. In the early years these proposals were quite modest in length and detail, but as the years passed the proposals became longer, more detailed, and elaborate in format and style. Often districts hired staff or consultants who were "professional" proposal writers.

2. Over the years, of course, individuals who had served on these panels returned to their districts with insights about what seemed to be most favorable to the proposal evaluators. These former panelists then were involved in writing ESEA Title IVc proposals in their own districts. Likely there was some interaction here between what they saw as "fundable" and the increasing complexity of the proposals that were subsequently submitted.

Appendix A

Project Name	Description
Discipline Plus	A project that attempts to "improve undisciplined and irresponsible student behavior" by implementing a program of daily instruction in the 2nd 3R's. Through an awareness of rules, rights, and responsibilities, and by reinforcement of positive behavior, pupils will develop competency in decision making regarding behavior alternatives, enhance their feelings of self-worth, and increase comprehension of the social reasons for rules and laws.
Language Improvement	This project will provide an enriched educational experience for both Hispanic and Anglo students in the areas of oral communication skills and positive social interaction. Due to the closure of the 50-year-old school previously attended, the Hispanic students are in a situation requiring sound integrative experience. By increasing the skills and sensitivity of the teachers and encouraging parent social interaction and involvement in school activities, the project aims to "bridge the gap" through increased ability of children to communicate verbally and interact socially.
Bilingual Affect	The purpose of the project is to provide NES/LES students at this school with a language program in English and Spanish that enables them to practice basic language structures and vocabulary items. Using the H200 Reading Series, the project hopes to make ESL teaching more relevant to the needs of the students at this school. Heavy emphasis is placed on using a confluent or affective approach in teaching these skills. Students will be encouraged to indicate their feelings about being in the class, to verbalize positive statements about themselves, and to use language drills and conversational activities to develop human relations skills.
Secondary Teaching	By restructuring the Secondary Schools curriculum content, organizational plan, and by providing staff with skills, expertise, and knowledge to teach this content and to plan effectively, the project aims to increase the reading, math, and language achievement scores of all high school students in the district.

New Reading	An attempt to combine a variety of reading/language arts methodologies into more effective system to teach reading or decoding skills to slow learners, NES/LES, beginning readers. Sounds from the students' aural/oral experiences are connected to visual clues which in turn are associated with a simplified printed alphabet. A dictionary and "translated" basic readers will provide the children with opportunities to use their reading/writing skills in a normal classroom situation.

References

Babbie, Earl R. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1979

Clark, David et al. (Eds.). New Perspectives on Planning in Educational Organizations. San Francisco: Far West Regional Lab, 1980.

Herriott, R.E. and N. Gross. The Dynamic of Planned Educational Change. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.